III. REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15 and 19 have been amended. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 11, 12 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arai (U.S. Patent No. 5,966,346), hereafter "Arai" in view of Guyett *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,147,935), hereafter "Guyett." Claims 8, 9, 13, 14, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai in view of Guyett and further in view of Thorgersen *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,524,101).

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-7, 11, 12 AND 15-18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER ARAI IN VIEW OF GUYETT

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection over Arai in view of Guyett, Applicants assert that the combined references cited by the Office do not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 11 and 15, Applicants

PAGE 8/16 * RCVD AT 6/15/2005 3:21:38 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-28

respectfully submit that the combined references fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a system for allowing a user to designate a plurality of distinct alarm signals concurrently. The Office admits that Arai does not disclose the system allowing the user to designate distinct alarm signals. To resolve this deficiency, the Office relies on a passage in Guyett, which states "...it will be appreciated that most people prefer to be awakened by music such as by a clock radio. To this end, there is further included a switch member connected to sound circuitry." Col. 7, line 66 through col. 8 line 3. To this extent, Guyett teaches a single switch member connected to the sound circuitry that, once switched, fixes the alarm type every time the alarm sounds. A user of the Guyett alarm clock would be incapable of designating a plurality of distinct alarm signals concurrently using the switch as taught. Thus, even if the cited references were combined, the single switch member in Guyett could not be used to designate both alarm A and alarm B in Arai concurrently. In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...a system for allowing a user to designate a plurality of distinct alarm signals concurrently." Claim 1. As such, the user of the claimed invention does not simply switch all alarm types to the same setting with a single switch member as in Guyett, but instead is allowed to designate a plurality of distinct alarm signals concurrently. For the above stated reasons, the switch of Guyett does not teach or suggest the system for allowing a user to designate a plurality of distinct alarm signals concurrently of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection.

With further respect to independent claim 11 and with respect to claims 3 and 15, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest allowing a user to designate a plurality of distinct volume levels concurrently for successive alarm signals. The

PAGE 9/16 * RCVD AT 6/15/2005 3:21:38 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-28

Office refers to a passage in Arai that teaches that alarm "B" is sounded in the form of a buzzer sound larger than the melody sound in alarm "A." Col. 2, lines 54-56. However, nowhere in this passage or elsewhere does Arai teach or suggest that a user is allowed to designate distinct volume levels for either alarm "A" or alarm "B," much less that a user is allowed to designate a plurality of distinct volume levels concurrently. Furthermore, Guyett does not teach that a user is allowed to designate a plurality of distinct volume levels concurrently. The claimed invention, in contrast, includes "...allowing a user to designate distinct a plurality of volume levels concurrently for successive alarm signals." Claim 11. As such, plurality of volume levels for the successive alarm signals as included in the claimed invention are not merely a buzzer that has a larger sound than a previous melody as in Arai, but instead a user is allowed to designate a plurality of distinct volume levels concurrently for successive alarm signals. Thus, the user designated distinct volume levels as included in the claimed invention are not equivalent to alarm "A" and alarm "B" in Arai. Guyett does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined references fail to teach or suggest that the user is allowed to designate the plurality of distinct alarm signals such that each successive activation of the snooze mechanism results in a new user designated alarm signal. Instead, as stated above, Guyett teaches a switch member for switching the same alarm every time the alarm sounds. Col. 7, line 65 through col. 8 line 4. Similarly, Arai teaches the sounding of a first alarm "A" and a second alarm "B." Col. 2, lines 39-41. However, Arai teaches only that the first alarm "A" may be a melody and that the second alarm "B" may be a buzzer. Col. 2, lines 50-56. To this extent, the cited references teach only two alarm types and,

PAGE 10/16 * RCVD AT 6/15/2005 3:21:38 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-28

as such, an activation of the snooze mechanism subsequent to the second must be one of the two indicated types and can therefore not be unique. Nowhere does the cited art teach or suggest that a user is allowed to designate a plurality of distinct alarm signals such that a new user designated alarm signal is produced each time the snooze mechanism is activated. In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...the user is allowed to designate the plurality of distinct alarm signals such that each successive activation of the snooze mechanism results in a new user designated alarm signal." Claim 2. As such, the alarm signals as included in the claimed invention are not limited to one alarm signal as in Guyett or a first alarm "A" and a second alarm "B" as in Arai, but instead, the user is allowed to designate the plurality of distinct alarm signals such that each successive activation of the snooze mechanism results in a new user designated alarm signal. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Office's rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 6, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest a harmonic system for allowing the user to designate a plurality of alarm signal harmonics concurrently. The Office relies of a passage of Guyett which states "[s]ound circuitry could also be a buzzer, but preferably, as discussed above, is a radio receiver, a CD player or other type of music making device, or even an IC chip which makes different and pleasant sounds." Col. 8, lines 19-21. However, Guyett never teaches that its sound circuitry includes a plurality of the above listed types that the user is allowed to choose from. Furthermore, Guyett does not teach or suggest that a user may designate a plurality of the above listed types concurrently. Likewise, Arai does not teach that a user is allowed to designate a plurality of alarm signal harmonics concurrently. In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...a harmonic system for allowing the user to designate a plurality of alarm signal harmonics concurrently."

PAGE 11/16 * RCVD AT 6/15/2005 3:21:38 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-28

Claim 6. As such, the claimed invention does not simply have a single sound circuitry that may be one of a number of devices as in Guyett, but instead allows the user to designate a plurality of alarm signal harmonics. Furthermore, in contrast to both Arai and Guyett the plurality of alarm signal harmonics may be designated concurrently. Thus, the combined features of Arai and Guyett do not teach or suggest the harmonic system of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to claim 7, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined references fail to teach or suggest a time system for designating a plurality of predetermined snooze times concurrently. Specifically, Guyett does not teach that the user may designate a snooze time interval. Furthermore, the rotary bezel in Arai allows for the setting of only one time interval and not a plurality of predetermined snooze times concurrently. Abstract. In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...a time system for designating a plurality of predetermined snooze times concurrently." Claim 7. As such, the time system as included in the claimed invention does not preclude the setting of a time interval as in Guyett or simply allow for the setting of a single time period as does the rotary bezel in Arai, but instead allows the user to designate a plurality of predetermined snooze times concurrently. For the above stated reasons, the time system as included in the claimed invention is not taught or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the rejection.

With respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined references fail to teach or suggest that each successive activation of the snooze mechanism results in a new alarm signal having a higher user designated volume level. Instead, in Guyett the volume level is the same every time the alarm sounds. Similarly, as argued above, Arai teaches that alarm "B" is

PAGE 12/16 * RCVD AT 6/15/2005 3:21:38 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-28

sounded in the form of a buzzer sound larger than the melody sound in alarm "A." Col. 2, lines 54-56. However, Arai never teaches the volumes of each successive alarm are user definable. Furthermore, Arai also does not teach a volume level higher than that of second alarm "B." In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...each successive activation of the snooze mechanism results in a new alarm signal having a higher user designated volume level." Claim 12. As such, the alarm signals as included in the claimed invention are not limited to a single alarm volume as in Guyett or a first volume and a second larger volume as in Arai, but instead, each successive activation of the snooze mechanism results in a new alarm signal having a higher user designated volume level. Furthermore, in contrast to the cited references, each new user alarm volume is user designated. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Office's rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims 1, 11 and 15 from which the claims depend. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 8, 9, 13, 14 AND 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) OVER ARAI IN VIEW OF GUYETT AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF THORGERSEN

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Arai in view of Guyett and further in view of Thorgersen, Applicants submit that the combined features of the cited art fail to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to claims 13 and 19, as argued above with respect to claim 7, the cited references fail to teach or suggest a time system for designating a plurality of predetermined snooze times concurrently. Furthermore, with respect to claim 13, as argued above with respect to claim 6, the cited references fail to teach or

PAGE 13/16 * RCVD AT 6/15/2005 3:21:38 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-28

suggest a harmonic system for allowing the user to designate a plurality of alarm signal harmonics concurrently. Thorgersen does not cure these deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

With respect to claims 8, 13, and 19, Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the argument of the Office, Thorgersen, fails to teach or suggest a motion detection system for allowing the user to designate a motion detection period, wherein an alarm function of the alarm clock is disabled if no motion is detected proximate the alarm clock during the motion detection period. The Office admits that neither Arai nor Guyett disclose the motion detection system of the claimed invention, but instead relies on a passage of Thorgersen, which refers to "...a motion sensor, and means coupled to the alarm sounding mechanism and the motion sensor for deactivating the alarm mechanism for a preselected time interval when the alarm sounding mechanism is activated. Col. 1, lines 59-62. The Office states that it would have been obvious to incorporate the motion sensor "...for the purpose of deactivating the alarm sounding mechanism *after a predetermined period.*" Office Action, page 3, emphasis added." However, Thorgerson does not teach deactivating the alarm sounding mechanism *after a predetermined period* as asserted by the Office, but rather deactivating the alarm mechanism *for a preselected time interval.* Furthermore, Thorgersen teaches that an alarm sounding mechanism is disabled for a period of time if motion **IS** detected and not if motion is **NOT** detected. Abstract. To this extent, Thorgersen teaches a temporary disabling of the alarm mechanism (i.e., a snooze) if motion is detected while the alarm is sounding, and not the disabling of the sounding of the alarm if no motion is detected during a set period of time (e.g., if the user is out of town). In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...a motion detection system for allowing the user to designate a

PAGE 14/16 * RCVD AT 6/15/2005 3:21:38 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-28

motion detection period, wherein an alarm function of the alarm clock is disabled if no motion is detected proximate the alarm clock during the motion detection period." Claim 8. As such, the motion detection system as included in the claimed invention does not disable a sounding mechanism if motion is detected as in Thorgersen, but instead, the alarm function of the alarm clock is disabled if no motion is detected proximate the alarm clock during the motion detection period. Neither Arai nor Guyett cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserve their right to do so should it become necessary.

PAGE 15/16 * RCVD AT 6/15/2005 3:21:38 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-28

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald A. D'Alessandro
Reg. No.: 42,456

Date: 6/15/05

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

PAGE 16/16 * RCVD AT 6/15/2005 3:21:38 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:518 449 0047 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-28